

**From:** Micheleanderic@att.net  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 7, 2003 8:37 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Michele Solowinski  
299 Carlton Avenue  
East Rutherford, New Jersey 07073

cc:  
Representative Steven Rothman  
Senator Jon Corzine  
Senator Frank Lautenberg

**From:** mbrown5758@aol.com  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 7, 2003 9:13 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Marcilla Brown  
414 fountain lake ct  
columbia, South Carolina 29209

**From:** mbrown5758@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 7, 2003 9:13 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Marcilla Brown  
414 fountain lake ct  
columbia, South Carolina 29209

**From:** gloria@alexshaw.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 7, 2003 9:42 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Gloria Shaw  
11362 S. Morgan St.  
Chicago, Illinois 60643-4657

cc:  
Senator Richard Durbin  
Senator Peter Fitzgerald  
Representative Jesse Jackson

**From:** petenjr@aol.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Apr 7, 2003 10:07 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Peter J Nevelus Jr.  
152 Stonybrook Rd.  
Stratford, Connecticut 06614

cc:  
Senator Christopher Dodd  
Senator Joseph Lieberman  
Representative Rosa DeLauro

**From:** G. McKinnon  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 8, 2003 12:35 AM  
**Subject:** Ownership deregulation

I am writing to urge you to VOTE AGAINST the deregulation of the nations media. There is already too much power over public information concentrated in the hands of a few large corporations.

The members of the FCC have a responsibility to represent all the citizens of our country, not just wealth special interests. I hope you will demonstrate that you understand the difference between our right to information and the motives of those who profit by constraining the sources of that information.

Regards,  
Gerald McKinnon



**From:** G. McKinnon  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 8, 2003 12:35 AM  
**Subject:** Ownership deregulation

I am writing to urge you to VOTE AGAINST the deregulation of the nations media. There is already too much power over public information concentrated in the hands of a few large corporations.

The members of the FCC have a responsibility to represent all the citizens of our country, not just wealth special interests. I hope you will demonstrate that you understand the difference between our right to information and the motives of those who profit by constraining the sources of that information.

Regards,  
Gerald McKinnon

**From:** Jim Stewart  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 8, 2003 3:45 AM  
**Subject:** Consolidation

Dear Chairmen Powell,

I agree with Commissioner Adelstein's remarks regarding radio consolidation given at Georgetown University on January 6. I read his text and found it ironic that Mr. Adelstein cited Yankton, South Dakota. (<http://www.fcc.gov/Speeches/Adelstein/2003/spjsa301.html>)

I live in Rapid City, SD and the state of radio here is awful with regards to local content. Take the recent sign-on of a station here, KQRQ-FM. Other than a morning show from 6am to 9am the rest of the day is voicetracked or completely automated with no announcers. KQRQ is essentially a 100,000 watt CD player.

KQRQ is like many of the stations in Rapid City. Most feature voicetracking by out of town announcers or automation. The weather forecasts are recorded hours in advance so you rarely get the current conditions. Where would a listener tune in the event of threatening weather? NOAA weather radio I guess. Thank goodness for the NOAA weather web site!

Even the station (KOTA-AM) which bills itself as the "Black Hills Information Superstation" (pardon me while I laugh) is only live from 5am to 10am and from 4pm til 5:30pm. The rest of the day is filled with syndicated programs and the weekends are nothing but syndicated talk shows.

Last summer the Black Hills had a terrible fire season. One fire burned to within a few miles of Rapid City. In fact, Mount Rushmore was closed for a few days during the fire. But that fire, called the Battle Creek Fire, started on a Friday night before a busy weekend of syndicated program and voicetracking. I would guess there wasn't more than 5 minutes of coverage of that fire on any of the stations.

Of course Rapid City is a small market and I understand broadcasting economics and I am not expecting major market talent. But what about the days when a station gave the current weather and a timecheck more meaningful than "12 past the hour"? It seems to me that radio today is more about a license to print money than a license to serve the public interest.

Sincerely,  
Jim Stewart  
Black Hawk, SD

**CC:** Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Jim Stewart  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 8, 2003 3:45 AM  
**Subject:** Consolidation

Dear Chairmen Powell,

I agree with Commissioner Adelstein's remarks regarding radio consolidation given at Georgetown University on January 6. I read his text and found it ironic that Mr. Adelstein cited Yankton, South Dakota. (<http://www.fcc.gov/Speeches/Adelstein/2003/spjsa301.html>)

I live in Rapid City, SD and the state of radio here is awful with regards to local content. Take the recent sign-on of a station here, KQRQ-FM. Other than a morning show from 6am to 9am the rest of the day is voicetracked or completely automated with no announcers. KQRQ is essentially a 100,000 watt CD player.

KQRQ is like many of the stations in Rapid City. Most feature voicetracking by out of town announcers or automation. The weather forecasts are recorded hours in advance so you rarely get the current conditions. Where would a listener tune in the event of threatening weather? NOAA weather radio I guess. Thank goodness for the NOAA weather web site!

Even the station (KOTA-AM) which bills itself as the "Black Hills Information Superstation" (pardon me while I laugh) is only live from 5am to 10am and from 4pm til 5:30pm. The rest of the day is filled with syndicated programs and the weekends are nothing but syndicated talk shows.

Last summer the Black Hills had a terrible fire season. One fire burned to within a few miles of Rapid City. In fact, Mount Rushmore was closed for a few days during the fire. But that fire, called the Battle Creek Fire, started on a Friday night before a busy weekend of syndicated program and voicetracking. I would guess there wasn't more than 5 minutes of coverage of that fire on any of the stations.

Of course Rapid City is a small market and I understand broadcasting economics and I am not expecting major market talent. But what about the days when a station gave the current weather and a timecheck more meaningful than "12 past the hour"? It seems to me that radio today is more about a license to print money than a license to serve the public interest.

Sincerely,  
Jim Stewart  
Black Hawk, SD

**CC:** Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Jim Stewart  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 8, 2003 3:46 AM  
**Subject:** Consolidation

Dear Chairmen Powell,

I agree with Commissioner Adelstein's remarks regarding radio consolidation given at Georgetown University on January 6. I read his text and found it ironic that Mr. Adelstein cited Yankton, South Dakota. (<http://www.fcc.gov/Speeches/Adelstein/2003/spjsa301.html>)

I live in Rapid City, SD and the state of radio here is awful with regards to local content. Take the recent sign-on of a station here, KQRQ-FM. Other than a morning show from 6am to 9am the rest of the day is voicetracked or completely automated with no announcers. KQRQ is essentially a 100,000 watt CD player.

KQRQ is like many of the stations in Rapid City. Most feature voicetracking by out of town announcers or automation. The weather forecasts are recorded hours in advance so you rarely get the current conditions. Where would a listener tune in the event of threatening weather? NOAA weather radio I guess. Thank goodness for the NOAA weather web site!

Even the station (KOTA-AM) which bills itself as the "Black Hills Information Superstation" (pardon me while I laugh) is only live from 5am to 10am and from 4pm til 5:30pm. The rest of the day is filled with syndicated programs and the weekends are nothing but syndicated talk shows.

Last summer the Black Hills had a terrible fire season. One fire burned to within a few miles of Rapid City. In fact, Mount Rushmore was closed for a few days during the fire. But that fire, called the Battle Creek Fire, started on a Friday night before a busy weekend of syndicated program and voicetracking. I would guess there wasn't more than 5 minutes of coverage of that fire on any of the stations.

Of course Rapid City is a small market and I understand broadcasting economics and I am not expecting major market talent. But what about the days when a station gave the current weather and a timecheck more meaningful than "12 past the hour"? It seems to me that radio today is more about a license to print money than a license to serve the public interest.

Sincerely,  
Jim Stewart  
Black Hawk, SD

**CC:** Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Jim Stewart  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 8, 2003 3:46 AM  
**Subject:** Consolidation

Dear Chairmen Powell,

I agree with Commissioner Adelstein's remarks regarding radio consolidation given at Georgetown University on January 6. I read his text and found it ironic that Mr. Adelstein cited Yankton, South Dakota. (<http://www.fcc.gov/Speeches/Adelstein/2003/spjsa301.html>)

I live in Rapid City, SD and the state of radio here is awful with regards to local content. Take the recent sign-on of a station here, KQRQ-FM. Other than a morning show from 6am to 9am the rest of the day is voicetracked or completely automated with no announcers. KQRQ is essentially a 100,000 watt CD player.

KQRQ is like many of the stations in Rapid City. Most feature voicetracking by out of town announcers or automation. The weather forecasts are recorded hours in advance so you rarely get the current conditions. Where would a listener tune in the event of threatening weather? NOAA weather radio I guess. Thank goodness for the NOAA weather web site!

Even the station (KOTA-AM) which bills itself as the "Black Hills Information Superstation" (pardon me while I laugh) is only live from 5am to 10am and from 4pm til 5:30pm. The rest of the day is filled with syndicated programs and the weekends are nothing but syndicated talk shows.

Last summer the Black Hills had a terrible fire season. One fire burned to within a few miles of Rapid City. In fact, Mount Rushmore was closed for a few days during the fire. But that fire, called the Battle Creek Fire, started on a Friday night before a busy weekend of syndicated program and voicetracking. I would guess there wasn't more than 5 minutes of coverage of that fire on any of the stations.

Of course Rapid City is a small market and I understand broadcasting economics and I am not expecting major market talent. But what about the days when a station gave the current weather and a timecheck more meaningful than "12 past the hour"? It seems to me that radio today is more about a license to print money than a license to serve the public interest.

Sincerely,  
Jim Stewart  
Black Hawk, SD

**CC:** Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** WetheP@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 8, 2003 5:42 AM  
**Subject:** Preserve Diversity

Dear Commissioners Powell, Abernathy, Copps, Martin, and Adelstein:

I am deeply concerned that large media conglomerates are swallowing up so many independent radio stations, TV stations, and other media sources. It is vital for democracy to preserve independent media sources in order to have as many voices and opinions heard, to preserve diversity -- that is what our country is about.

Please do not allow the large media companies to get even larger. If this happens, it will be much harder to find out what is really going on in the world.

Very truly yours,

Lauri Zarin  
95 Henry Sanford Rd.  
Bridgewater, CT 06752

**From:** WetheP@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 8, 2003 5:43 AM  
**Subject:** Preserve Diversity

Dear Commissioners Powell, Abernathy, Copps, Martin, and Adelstein:

I am deeply concerned that large media conglomerates are swallowing up so many independent radio stations, TV stations, and other media sources. It is vital for democracy to preserve independent media sources in order to have as many voices and opinions heard, to preserve diversity -- that is what our country is about.

Please do not allow the large media companies to get even larger. If this happens, it will be much harder to find out what is really going on in the world.

Very truly yours,

Lauri Zarin  
95 Henry Sanford Rd.  
Bridgewater, CT 06752

02-277

**From:** bonowb@elltel.net  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sat, Apr 5, 2003 2:58 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
RECEIVED

APR - 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.



Sincerely,

Burnett Bonow  
6251 Cove Rd  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

**From:** bonowb@elltel.net  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sat, Apr 5, 2003 2:58 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

RECEIVED

APR - 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Sincerely,

Burnett Bonow  
6251 Cove Rd  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

**From:** RUDOLPHLOCAL95@webtv.net  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sat, Apr 5, 2003 4:05 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

RECEIVED

APR - 9 2003

Division

Sincerely,

MR. Rudolph Ruffin  
234 Ralph Ave. #3B  
Brooklyn, New York 11233-2251

**From:** RUDOLPHLOCAL95@webtv.net  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sat, Apr 5, 2003 4:05 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
RECEIVED

APR - 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Sincerely,

MR. Rudolph Ruffin  
234 Ralph Ave. #3B  
Brooklyn, New York 11233-2251

**From:** RUDOLPHLOCAL95@webtv.net  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sat, Apr 5, 2003 4:05 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

APR - 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary



Sincerely,

MR. Rudolph Ruffin  
234 Ralph Ave. #3B  
Brooklyn, New York 11233-2251